





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
LYRASIS members and Sloan Foundation

<http://www.archive.org/details/laSalle2519801981unse>

28 Dec.

SEASIDE GREETINGS



SEASIDE GREETINGS

Robert S. Lyons, Jr., '61, *Editor*
James J. McDonald, '58, *Alumni News*

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION OFFICERS

Terence K. Heaney, Esq., '63, *President*
John J. Fallon, '67, *Executive Vice President*
Diane M. Bones, '75, *Vice President*
Marie Konzik Parrott, Esq., '73, *Secretary*
Paul J. Foley, '74, *Treasurer*



Brother John as a Young Man, Page 9



The Unbeaten Debaters, Page 19



Hosting the President, Page 23

Volume 25

Winter, 1980-81

Number 1

laSALLE

A QUARTERLY LA SALLE COLLEGE MAGAZINE

(USPS 299-940)

Contents

1 BALANCING THE SCALES

The philosophical rationale for intercollegiate athletics is examined in this excerpt from a book to be published later this year.

9 PORTFOLIO FOR A SPECIAL BIRTHDAY

Brother Edward John, F.S.C., a beloved member of the college community, is celebrating his 90th birthday, an event that prompts a touching glimpse of some precious moments in the lives of a very special family.

13 THE MADMAN OF THE NORTH

A La Salle historian recalls the saga of Sweden's Charles XII, the last of the warrior kings, whose defeat permitted Russia's entry into European politics.

19 THE "WORLD CHAMPS" FROM LA SALLE

Half the student body used to cheer the college's debaters as they challenged the best from both sides of Atlantic, conducted their own radio show, and made personal appearances throughout the region.

23 AROUND CAMPUS

A member of La Salle's Evening Division faculty hosted a very special guest recently and became a national celebrity for a few days. Also, a report on new members of the Council of President's Associates.

25 ALUMNI NEWS

A chronicle of some significant events in the lives of the college's alumni including an account of the annual Alumni Awards Dinner and Signum Fidei Medal presentation.

CREDITS—Front cover watercolor and artwork on page 18 by Omnidgraphic Design; back cover, courtesy of La Salle College Art Gallery; inside back cover, Lewis Tanner; page 2, 5-7, Mike Maicher; 3 (right), Mark B. Jacobson; 9-12, 19, La Salle College Archives; 13, painting by D. Von Kraft; 22, Charles F. Sibre; 23, Bob Sacha, *Philadelphia Inquirer*; 27, Jules Schick; all others by Tanner.

La Salle Magazine is published quarterly by La Salle College, Philadelphia, Penna. 19141, for the alumni, students, faculty and friends of the college. Editorial and business offices located at the News Bureau, La Salle College, Philadelphia, Penna. 19141. Second class postage paid at Philadelphia, Penna. Changes of address should be sent at least 30 days prior to publication of the issue with which it is to take effect, to the Alumni Office, La Salle College, Philadelphia, Penna. 19141. Member of the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

STUDENT-ATHLETES: BALANCING THE SCALES

By Joseph C. Mihalich, Ph.D.

Intercollegiate sports and athletic programs are once again under fire from a variety of sources alleging various forms of academically related abuses and corruptions. The criticism begins with traditional references to student-athletes as "dumb jocks" with no interest or ability in higher education, and extends to the complicity of academic administrators in connection with altered transcripts and mythical courses and Mickey Mouse study programs to guarantee athletic eligibility. John Underwood's *Sports Illustrated* article (May 1980) on "Student-Athletes: The Shame, The Shame" is a documented commentary on more than a dozen cases of academic/athletic malfeasance in major colleges and universities. The scholarly *Phi Beta Kappa* (September 1980) published a panel discussion on "Student-Athletes: Tackling the Problem" in which John Wooden and Joe Paterno agree that ". . . the ills of intercollegiate athletics come from management." *The New York Times* carried excerpts from the University of Southern California's self-study report (October 1980) issued after USC was sanctioned by the NCAA and the Pacific 10 Conference for athletically related academic violations.

This two-part series on intercollegiate sports programs and student-athletes attempts to balance the scales somewhat and to put things into better perspective. This first installment suggests the rationale for intercollegiate sports and athletics, and discusses issues and problems relating to the life and times of intercollegiate student-athletes. The second segment proposes instruments and techniques to improve the possibility of academic success for serious student-athletes, and offers recommendations for the establishment of ethically sound sports programs with integrity and probity for student-athletes and the institution as well. Despite this justified concern about abuses and corruptions in intercollegiate sports and athletics, most student-athletes in most of the 800 member institutions in the NCAA (and AIAW) are serious and capable students and the institutions themselves are genuinely and properly concerned about realistic academic progress and timely graduation. The sins of the few should not be visited indiscriminately upon the moral majority.

These articles are excerpted from the author's forthcoming book entitled *Sports and Athletics: Philosophy in Action*, scheduled for publication by Littlefield, Adams Company in 1981.

Sports and athletics historically constitute one of the most basic and most universal forms of human interest and human activity, and more specifically constitute an essential and constructive dimension of educational and social development at every stage and especially in higher education. These contentions derive from the notion that sports and athletics constitute the greatest opportunity for the greatest number of people to achieve and to witness human excellence (*Sport: A Philosophic Inquiry*, Paul Weiss). This argument relates easily and naturally to the case for intercollegiate sports and athletic programs, since the main business of colleges and universities is to encourage and produce human excellence in every form. Intercollegiate sports and athletic programs are probably

the most popular and most controversial area of the contemporary sports scene, and vociferous debates are waged constantly about the true nature and purpose of intercollegiate sports programs in the context of the pursuit of higher education. As in every other area of sports and athletics, intercollegiate sports and athletics have the powerful potential to produce human excellence and also the disastrous potential for abuse and corruption. The latter potential is particularly disturbing in intercollegiate sports and athletics, since it involves the scarring of lofty educational ideals and the betrayal of sacred trusts ingrained in the guiding institutions of civilizations.

These articles address some of the controversial issues and aspects of intercollegiate sports and athletics, with

special focus on the intercollegiate student-athlete as the central figure in the process and much of the controversy. The first installment suggests the rationale for intercollegiate sports and athletics, and discusses issues and problems relating to the life and times of intercollegiate student-athletes. The second segment proposes instruments and techniques to improve the possibility of academic success for serious student-athletes, and offers recommendations for the establishment of ethically sound sports programs with integrity and probity for student-athletes and the institution as well.

The rationale for intercollegiate sports and athletics and intercollegiate student-athletes is the traditional and firmly established recognition of sports and athletics as an integral and constructive dimension of educational and social development especially at the college level. Colleges and universities recognize the values and the contributions of sports and athletics in the *total* college experience of students and alumni, and in the progress and well-being of the institution itself. La Salle College has maintained a varsity sports program for the past 50 years and describes its views on intercollegiate athletics this way:

- The College believes that organized intercollegiate and intramural sports programs and free physical activities are an integral part of the college experience.
- The College believes that in keeping with its commitment to the education of the whole person it should provide opportunities for sports participation and witnessing.
- The College believes that in a society where athletics plays such an integral role the publicity generated by our various athletic programs does much to bring the name of the College before the public.
- Participation in athletic activities and witnessing such activities are viewed as contributing to the well-being and development of the individual, as well as fostering a sense of belonging to the College community.

Dr. Thomas N. McCarthy, former top administrator for our athletic program, elaborates these statements in contending that:

- An intercollegiate athletic program contributes to the personal development of those who participate and witness, and the kind of development fostered by such activities overlaps with the kind of development that the College hopes to foster through its academic and other programs:
 1. Learning the importance of preparation to achieve goals.
 2. Learning to abide by rules.
 3. Learning how to delay the need for immediate gratification for the sake of long-range objectives.
 4. Learning how to work in collaboration with others while also perfecting one's own individual skills.
 5. Learning about one's own capacities and limits (physical and emotional, motivational and intellectual) in practices and contests where feedback tends to be clear and prompt.

- A college that offers a rounded program of intercollegiate athletics is a significantly more attractive place to prospective students, has a better chance of retaining students it admits, and increases the likelihood that alumni will maintain their allegiance to the school. The quality of a college's intercollegiate program either enhances or diminishes the institution as a whole.

In a review article assessing the values of intercollegiate athletics (in *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* 1979), eminent scholar and sports philosopher Klaus V. Meier refers to "... the possibilities of perceiving sports and athletics as true educational components of the liberal arts program, serving as important forums for the growth of the student (leading to) the incorporation of both procedural and propositional knowledge, of new perceptions and awareness of self, and of the development of personal identity elicited during engagement of sport." Many such testimonials exist extolling the virtues of intercollegiate sports and athletics, and this despite the unfortunate but consistent instances of deplorable malpractices in some intercollegiate sports programs. In his *Sports in America*, James Michener quotes a letter from George H. Hanford, serving as executive vice-president of the prestigious College Entrance Examination Board of Princeton, who prepared a scholarly and comprehensive study of intercollegiate sports and athletics (*An Inquiry into the Need for and Feasibility of a National Study of Intercollegiate Athletics*):

I do not side with those who claim that the negative effects of unethical practices in intercollegiate athletics outweigh the positive values. There is an infection, and because it could spread, something needs to be done to control it. On balance, however, I believe that there is much more that is healthy about intercollegiate athletics than is sick.

This article focuses on one of the most critical and most basic factors in intercollegiate athletics: the opportunities and motivation for successful academic performance by intercollegiate student-athletes compared to non-athlete students in typical campus settings. This analysis proceeds from two basic premises about student-athletes and higher education in academically sincere colleges and universities. The first premise is that every self-respecting college and university should regard student-athletes as students first and athletes second, and should be genuinely committed to the academic progress and timely graduation of student-athletes as the first priority. Colleges and universities must be keenly aware that the main business of such institutions is to develop the mind of all students and not just their bodies in the interests of athletic achievement.

The second basic premise is that intercollegiate student-athletes experience real and unique physical and psychological pressures and unusual demands on their time and energy, and these must be considered by the administration and faculty in the interests of justice to all students and to the institution itself. These pressures and demands

vary in intensity depending on the nature and extent of athletic involvement by the individual student-athlete. Student-athletes involved in serious National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) or Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) Division I competition in major sports are naturally more burdened than student-athletes in less competitive programs requiring less time and fewer persistent pressures. Academically sincere colleges and universities should establish athletic policies that are carefully consistent with NCAA and AIAW regulations and recommendations, and also with the practices and rules of the athletic conferences and leagues in which they compete.

The broader context for this discussion is that intercollegiate student-athletes at typical institutions constitute just one of several identifiable categories of students on campus with unique abilities or histories which set them apart from the rest of the student body. Because of these distinctive abilities or histories, these categories of students sometimes require and receive certain considerations in their academic life not necessarily required by other students—although they may be available to all students in a variety of ways. These considerations tend to center on special counseling and tutorial opportunities, but

they often extend to different or more flexible admissions standards and more interpretive academic procedures compared to the routine for the rest of the student population (more freedom in rostering and course selection and some aspects of grading policies among other things).

In addition to student-athletes, typical examples of special interest groups in most colleges and universities would be educationally and socially underprivileged students; special programs for continuing education students (older students and students whose academic careers have been interrupted); Honors Program students; military veteran students; faculty dependent students (spouses and children); and always the special interest cases involving relatives and friends of the administrative hierarchy and faculty. While the comparison may be less than exact in every respect, some mention might be made also of handicapped students and expanding institutional concern to accommodate this minority's special needs physically and academically.

Keeping in mind the distinction drawn earlier regarding levels of seriousness and intensity in athletic involvement by individual student-athletes, the plight of the intercollegiate student-athlete is easily depicted. Compared to non-athlete students, the serious student-athlete has two

La Salle athletics: An NIT basketball team from the '40's, and a women's basketball game in the '70's.





Explorers in action: soccer in the '60's; field hockey in the '70's

sets of responsibilities and obligations and two sets of goals and objectives. Student-athletes are required and expected to succeed academically and also athletically, and the dual requirements naturally intensify and often complicate the normal routine of the college experience. These dual requirements subject student-athletes to two sets of taskmasters vying for their undivided time and attention; two sets of priorities vying for their finite time and energy; and two sets of possibilities for success and failure with all the attendant anxieties and hopes and fears.

Serious intercollegiate student-athletes are pressured physically by demanding and often extended practices and contests, and pressured psychologically in many ways including required absences from class and lack of free time to complete routine classroom assignments and other academic obligations. Perhaps the greatest pressure of all in the college life of student-athletes is the total inflexibility of athletic participation—practices and contests and the need for physical and mental readiness occur on a relentless daily schedule that lasts for months and exists always in the recesses of consciousness. Many student-athletes have commented about this in various publications, and a good firsthand summary is contained in a two-part series written by Barnett Wright in the *Temple Daily News* (Philadelphia, Pa., 30-31 October 1979). In contrast with the situation of the serious student-athlete, the college life of the non-athlete student with a single set of goals and objectives is normally less pressured and generally more flexible in terms of time and freedom for successful academic performance. Certainly there are problems and tensions in the life of non-athlete students (especially those who must work extensively to obtain funds for tuition and support), but normally these students have the benefit of more numerous options and more flexibility in their time and energy schedule.

One common rejoinder to these contentions is that intercollegiate student-athletes are adequately reimbursed for their time and troubles through athletic grants-in-aid providing tuition and room and board and books in whole or in part. It is true that athletic grants-in-aid are an accepted and integral part of the athletic structure for most student-athletes at most institutions, but the very nature of this contractual agreement leads to the pressures and demands on student-athletes already delineated. Intercollegiate student-athletes on grants are required to perform services for the institution on a *quid pro quo* basis, and the pact is for the mutual benefit of student-athletes and the institution itself. The rationale for athletic grants-in-aid is that student-athletes make contributions to the college now and into the future generally unmatched by the activities of most non-athlete students. One notable comparison might be made between student-athletes adding to the image of the school, and student winners of prestigious academic awards and grants which redound to the credit of the institution (most of whom represent an Honors Program background with all the rights and privileges thereunto appertaining).

Athletic grants-in-aid constitute a controversial issue in many respects. Some institutions insist that all grants must be based on financial need alone with no regard for any special abilities in athletics or academics. This was the major issue hotly debated in the 1976 NCAA national convention in St. Louis, and the proposal to base all grants on financial need alone was defeated in a vote representing some 800 member institutions. The main area of opposition then and now is the flexibility of interpretation by individual institutions as to what constitutes financial need and the resultant potential for abuse. NCAA Division III institutions (and some individual conferences—notably the Ivy League) reject athletic grants and base all grants on financial need alone. Many institutions are selective in their



policy, and require participants in some sports to submit financial aid statements while exempting participants in major sports programs as an inducement in recruiting bluechip prospects for such programs.

Serious intercollegiate student-athletes tend to be troubled figures from the very beginning of their college careers. Usually they come to college from a distinguished high school athletic career including special recognition by the student body and the administration and faculty. Usually they have been highly recruited with standard recruiting techniques centering on their superior athletic abilities and their uniqueness amongst their peers. This often leads to a rude awakening for freshman student-athletes who suddenly find they are only one of several equally distinguished and equally accomplished former high school athletes destined to compete intensely with one another for continued athletic acceptance and recognition. Simultaneously they are confronted with academic procedures requiring much more initiative and self-reliance compared to high school, and the expectation to perform more effectively in the classroom than ever before. Much of this is part of the routine initiation to the demands of college life, but the situation is significantly compounded for most student-athletes compared to non-athlete students. Some of this pressure might be alleviated if freshmen were ineligible to compete in varsity sports, but the demands and ambitions of major college sports programs make restoration of the freshman ineligibility rule something of a lost cause.

Intercollegiate student-athletes very often are subjected to real or perceived bias and prejudice from various segments of the college community especially the student body and faculty. They tend to be stereotyped in their interests and intellectual ability and ambition, and they are often associated with an "elitist syndrome" in which they

are perceived to regard themselves as different and superior to the rest of the student population. Probably the only type of comment that can be offered is that bias and prejudice undeniably exist in various forms as deficiencies in the human spirit, and that unsupportable generalizations and dubious stereotyping are as inaccurate about intercollegiate student-athletes as any other segment of the college community or society in general. An interesting psychological summary of these campus perceptions about student-athletes with recommendations for coping is contained in Ron Tongate's article "Athletes: Counseling the Overprivileged Minority," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* (June 1978).

Some special comments should be added about the compounded plight of increasing numbers of female intercollegiate student-athletes in the wake of Title IX legislation and increased social consciousness for sexual equality. Especially in colleges and universities which turn coeducational from all-male student bodies (notably some of the Ivy League institutions), female students sometimes encounter overt and subtle opposition in their rightful efforts to be recognized as persons and as academically qualified and purposeful individuals. Female intercollegiate student-athletes face the added burden of establishing recognition and acceptance as serious and accomplished athletes. Extensive female participation in organized intercollegiate and professional athletics is relative recent in origin (the AIAW was founded only in 1970), and female athletes still encounter lingering suspicion and cultural opposition in their desire to combine athletic participation and feminine respectability. "Some people just cannot understand why females would want to get all sweaty and display themselves in public in such traditionally masculine pursuits."

Staunch ERA advocates and some interpretations of

ATHLETICS—continued

Title IX would quickly supply definitive and comprehensive answers to such questions, but in the meantime female intercollegiate student-athletes are left to confront the inequity and patronizing and indifference they often receive on campuses throughout the nation. Several lawsuits have already been filed by female student-athletes at various institutions alleging sex discrimination between male and female sports programs in financial and other areas protected by Title IX provisions. Probably the most viable future for female student-athletes is to avoid the emergence or creation of a female "jock image" by maintaining an acceptable feminine perspective along with athletic achievement. The basic principle is that female intercollegiate student-athletes want to be perceived as just what they are: legitimate students with sound academic goals and also serious athletes who participate for much the same reasons as male athletes.

Probably the most sensitive area of the college experience for intercollegiate student-athletes involves the bias and prejudice they really encounter or at least perceive in some faculty members in their academic relationship. This bias and prejudice extend in both directions—some faculty members are perceptually prejudiced in favor of athletes and tend to be sympathetic in the relationship, while other faculty members are perceptually prejudiced against athletes and tend to be intolerant in academic procedures. Bias and prejudices were mentioned earlier as ubiquitous deficiencies in the human spirit, and probably nothing much more can be added in the context of faculty attitudes. It should be observed that alleged faculty bias and prejudice extend beyond athletics into such areas as race and sex and major academic fields: "... Those pre-med majors don't really want to learn—all they worry about is A grades so they can get into med school ... Those business administration people

have their heads in a ledger and can't relate to anything cultural or ideological ... Well, what can you expect from a philosophy major. . . ."

One tends to hear facile and pseudo-psychological assessments of some faculty members as frustrated and/or disillusioned former athletes, along with references to the popular image of college professors as ascetic and intellectual elites with little or no feel for physical existence. Some interesting national studies indicate a curious ambivalence in the image of faculty members in American colleges and universities. These studies are cited in an article by Robert T. Blackburn and Michael S. Nyikos "College Football and Mr. Chips: All in the Family (*Phi Delta Kappan* October 1974). The studies contend that individually college faculty members are much more athletically inclined than the popular image would suggest, and rank high in the percentage of amateur participants (notably in running and racquet games) and are faithful if sometimes furtive spectators at intercollegiate athletic contests. The studies add that the more prestigious the institution usually the higher the percentage of individual faculty participation and spectatorship. "At intellectually elite and bucolic Carleton, over 80% of the faculty attend athletic contests and over 60% personally participate in some sport."

The fictional image of the professor as an effete recluse who lies down at the mere thought of exercise until the idea passes, and who would never be caught dead at an athletic event, is simply a gross distortion of reality. A very large number of faculty people really like sports ... competitive behavior is consistent with faculty values and not contradictory. Faculty set high standards for themselves as well as for others. They admire the self-discipline and self-sacrifice a quality performance de-

Baseball and track at La Salle in the '50's.



mands . . . professors respect expertise—in the scholarly, the string quartet and the smoothly functioning backfield.

The studies indicate that the ambivalence in faculty attitudes about sports and athletics originates in the collective image projected by faculty members as a group. Collectively faculty members tend to project an aloof and arrogant and disdainful attitude toward intercollegiate and professional sports, and only grudgingly accept college athletic programs as necessary evils. Their professional mandate is to extol and exalt scholarship and rationality as the highest academic values, and this conflicts with their private acceptance and support of sports and athletics. "Mr. Chips behaves differently when speaking for himself than he does when on the floor of the faculty senate." Their collective defense usually utilizes three standard ploys which can be summarized as follows: Freudian repression of the whole issue by preventing or aborting debates on the legitimacy of intercollegiate athletics; adoption and support of proposals and platforms which are academically correct but have no real bearing or impact on the structure or the future of intercollegiate athletics; and suggesting reforms rather than the abolition of intercollegiate athletics.

They elect a distinguished and able and revered colleague and instruct him to institute reforms that will bring back the good old days when all that really mattered was how you played the game and not who won. Even if all the other members of the conference are evil and only acting to ensure a victorious team for themselves, we wish to be pure . . . And so the individual and collective faculty guilt is transferred to one saintly individual and the whole ugly business is buried for another year.

Intercollegiate student-athletes who voice opinions on the issue both privately and publicly feel rather strongly that they are sometimes discriminated against by some faculty members simply because they are athletes. Their perception is that they are hurt more than they are helped by being student-athletes. The star performers in major sports at a given school are readily recognized by almost all faculty members because of their local and national publicity, and therefore tend to bear the brunt of the burden. Most if not all athletes in a given institution eventually come to be recognized or identified through various procedures and thus come to be vulnerable to the process. Many colleges and universities use some system of academic evaluation forms for student-athletes sent periodically to their professors, and such a system quickly identifies student-athletes in given groups and throughout the school. These systems are meritorious in themselves and with proper cooperation generally beneficial to student-athletes and to faculty members themselves. Faculty members are also frequently notified by the institution's athletic department regarding necessary absences by student-athletes for traveling purposes and contests and practice sessions. One of the paradoxical results from all this is student-athletes' complaints that they are monitored too much and too closely compared to non-athlete students. Incidentally students in some of the other special student categories mentioned earlier (underprivileged students; honors students and others) sometimes complain about similar perceived discrimination related to special identification processes.

Probably the fundamental type of complaint by intercollegiate student-athletes in this area is their perception that some faculty members tend to write-off student-athletes as serious students before they have a chance to



ATHLETICS—continued

prove themselves. Many student-athletes feel that some faculty members have pre-conceived suspicions about the intellectual ability and academic ambition of athletes and are reluctant to accept student-athletes on a par with other students. Typical comments stemming from this view often center on the perception of a double standard allegedly used by some faculty members regarding makeup examinations, submission of late classroom assignments and absences from class. Student-athletes who talk about this say such things as ". . . I know that if I wasn't an athlete he would have let me take that makeup exam—he let other people in the class take it . . . she let other people turn in that paper late but she wouldn't take mine . . . I told him we had an away game and I gave him my cut-slip but he said he didn't care—and half the people in that class are absent half the time anyway." Some faculty members in turn contend that student-athletes take advantage of the situation and sometimes abuse whatever privileges they deserve. Probably this happens on occasion and any such tendencies must be deplored, but non-athlete students as well sometimes take unfair advantage of extracurricular involvements and responsibilities in much the same manner.

In the interests of balance and justice and a true picture, it must be emphasized that such comments and contentions reflect *perceptions* by intercollegiate student-athletes with no attempt at empirical justification or statistical foundation. Much of this may be simply parroted or handed down from one generation of student-athletes to the next with no real attempts at objective evaluation, and some of it may be said just to fit the popular image of things. Statistics are well-nigh impossible since faculty members are understandably reluctant to shout their prejudices for or against athletes for all the world to hear. The consolation and the balance occur in the unanimous contention by intercollegiate student-athletes that the vast majority of faculty members everywhere are fair and objective in their academic relationship with student-athletes and non-athlete students alike.

It can be maintained that the cardinal sin for colleges

and universities is the exploitation of students for athletic purposes unrelated to the fundamental institution mandate to *educate* and to develop the intellectual potential and cultural sophistication of all students. The sometimes subtle but *de facto* denial of meaningful college education for some students at some colleges and universities in the name of athletic achievement is particularly distasteful because it involves the scarring of such lofty ideals and such sacred trusts. Academically honest colleges and universities with nationally competitive sports programs must observe the basic guideline that intercollegiate student-athletes are students first and athletes second in the context of their college experience. Such institutions must establish some system of empirical evidence to monitor student-athletes' academic progress and ensure their timely graduation, and the measuring devices should be rigorous and extensive and effective.

Colleges and universities with serious sports programs must be reasonably and justly concerned about the unique physical and psychological pressures and unusual time-energy demands on student-athletes, and must recognize the reciprocal and mutually beneficial character of the institution's contractual agreement with student-athletes. Such institutions are morally obligated to provide the climate and the motivational support for successful academic performance and balanced athletic achievement with integrity and probity for the institution and the student-athlete. Sports and athletics are an integral and indispensable aspect of higher education in contemporary society, and intelligent and humanistic concern for the academic success of intercollegiate student-athletes can only enhance the stature and prestige of our colleges and universities and contribute to the pursuit of human excellence.

(Next Issue: Toward Sanity and Perspective)

Dr. Mihalich is a professor of philosophy at La Salle and former chairman of the college's Athletic Committee. His "Philosophy of Sport" course is now an annual part of the college's curriculum.

Explorer varsity swimmers at Hayman Hall.





Portfolio for a Special Birthday

On February 1, he will be celebrating his 90th birthday. Almost two-thirds of his ninety years have been spent at La Salle, first as a teacher in the High School's commercial department, but then for many decades as the exemplary Bursar of the College. He is Brother Edward John, and in his long life he has carved for himself an important place in the memory of Lasallians, who esteem him for his energetic spirit, sunny disposition, preservering work, and unflagging loyalty to students and alumni.

Over these years he has seen great changes in the College, no less than in the world at large. When he first came to La Salle in 1916, there were only two basic programs, arts and engineering, and these had graduated only eight students that year. By May, 1980, these had grown to over thirty programs and over a thousand graduates. And for better or worse, the world has moved from

the horse and buggy days of his boyhood in Indiana to the age of space-probes and nuclear plants.

Despite such far-reaching changes, Brother John's life has had a steady course, one marked by the quiet routine of religious life, the daily round of his office duties, the interest of several hobbies, the warmth of a familiar circle of friends. But it should be added that he has always been busy, still is in fact in his retirement at the Villa of Divine Providence in Lansdale. There he continues a vigorous battle against the effects of two broken hips and of arthritis and goes on briskly with sorting out the memorabilia of almost a century. We're happy to present here some pictures from that sorting out, which, truth to say, we borrowed from him under false pretences.

—BROTHER DANIEL BURKE, F.S.C., Ph.D.

BR. JOHN—continued

His grandfather, Stephan Allgeir, came to America in 1836 from Germany, settled briefly in western Pennsylvania, then moved to Indiana and took up the trade of cooper. Brother John's father, Henry, was born on the family farm on December 27, 1851. As a young man, however, he moved into Fort Wayne and, after several mill jobs, started a metal products firm of his own. Together

with his young bride Mary Fisher, he raised, as the picture here suggests, a large, handsome family that was blessed with many religious vocations, these finally numbering seven—a diocesan priest, three School Sisters of Notre Dame, and three Christian Brothers, including Brother John (standing, 2nd from right).



Albert was the fifth child of the Allgeir family, born on February 1, 1891. Like his brothers, he attended St. Mary's parochial school in Fort Wayne. He is pictured here with his high school graduating class, looking very much, don't you think, like a young Prince Charles. In the next few

years, he furthered his education at the Fort Wayne Business School, gave a hand with the Allgeir Manufacturing Company, and finally got a job with the Lincoln Insurance Company.

One of the major activities in St. Mary's parish was its Athletic Club. The Club sponsored one of the earliest basketball teams that the Hoosier state was later to become famous for. Albert sits here with the Club's championship team as it posed rather classically for the photog-

rapher in 1910. He continued his active and spectator interest in sports long thereafter; he was, for example, a jogger on the beaches of Ocean City, New Jersey, long before that form of exercise was as fashionable as it now is.



As an all-American product of the mid-West, it was appropriately on July 4, 1911 that Albert followed in the footsteps of his older brother Julius and entered the Brothers' Novitiate in Ammendale, Maryland. His further academic training was brief, and he had early teaching assignments in Cumberland, Maryland; Scranton, Pennsylvania; and Augusta, Georgia. But in 1916, he came to

the commercial department of La Salle High School, which at the time shared quarters with the College in the Bouvier Mansion (the ancestral home of Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis) at 1240 North Broad Street. There he began making his mark as a teacher with perfectionist standards—and a very big heart.

BR. JOHN—continued

Brother John had several brief assignments in the next few years before returning to La Salle in 1926, to remain here for the rest of his very active career. Perhaps, the most interesting of these tours of duty was at St. Emma's School in Belmead, Virginia, an agricultural and industrial

school for young blacks that occupied a large campus and farm on the James River some forty miles from Richmond. The institution was run as a military school, and it was not unusual to see Brother John in his Army uniform on an early morning gallop.



Perhaps, only Professor Roland Holroyd has had a more continuous tenure at the College in this century. Like the good Doctor, Brother John has been served well by a tenacious memory in keeping track of numerous generations of students, most especially the earliest classes which he taught in business subjects. These latter especially are in frequent contact with him now in his retire-

ment. Here, for example, he is shown visiting two years ago with Alfonso J. Clearkin, '18. And in the varied interests that still enliven his advanced years, they retain the first place in his concern and his prayer. They especially would want to join us in wishing Brother Edward John the happiest of his very many birthdays!

THE MADMAN OF THE NORTH AND RUSSIA'S ENTRY INTO EUROPEAN POLITICS

By Dennis J. McCarthy, '47



T

The darkness of the cold night was cut by fire bombs exploding amidst the trenches which the Swedes had dug around the Norwegian fortress of Fredriksten. Musket fire from the fort sought shadowy targets among the attacking force. Not many men fell that November night in 1718, but one who did was Charles XII, King of Sweden, the last of the warrior kings.

Charles XII was in the 36th year of his life and the 21st of his reign. He had for a time led seemingly invincible armies, had inspired admiration and awe throughout Europe, and had been called the "Lion of the North." He had also suffered the most disastrous of defeats at Poltava, a defeat which permitted Russia, Prussia, Hanover, and Denmark to seize large pieces of the once powerful Swedish Empire. In the broad perspective of history, Fredriksten is anti-climatic to Poltava. It was Poltava which sealed Sweden's doom and opened the gates of Europe to the Russia of Peter the Great. Fredriksten, however, marks the end of the epic adventures of Charles XII, the most bizarre, heroic, tragic, and fantastic figure of his—or any—age.

When Charles, at the age of eighteen, routed the Russians at Narva, though greatly outnumbered; when he defeated Saxon armies in Poland and placed a new king upon the throne of that hapless state; when he invaded Saxony and seemed likely to determine the balance among the great powers then embroiled in the War of the Spanish Succession, he was the "Lion of the North." Some called him the "Madman of the North" because of his insistence upon personally leading his troops in frontal charges in battle.

Charles had come to the throne of Sweden at the age of fifteen in 1697. Sweden was a power of consequence at the time. She held Finland, Ingria, Estonia, Livonia, part of Pomerania, and the German bishoprics of Bremen and Verden. She controlled the mouths of the Neva, Duna, Oder, Elbe, and Weser rivers. Her provinces on the eastern shore of the Baltic denied Russia access to the sea and the commerce of Europe. The Baltic was a Swedish lake.

Sweden's position among the European powers, however, was somewhat superficial. She lacked the resources to maintain such an empire in the face of a serious challenge. Russia and Brandenburg-Prussia were about to become powerful forces in the European cauldron. And others, too, cast envious eyes upon Sweden's blooming provinces. Sweden was about to be challenged.

Peter, later called the Great, Granduke of Muscovy and Tsar of the Russians; Augustus the Strong, Duke of Saxony and the elected King of Poland, and, reputedly, the sire of 365 illegitimate children; and Frederick, IV, King of Denmark, cast covetous eyes upon the Baltic and German holdings of the "boy-king" of Sweden, whose only interests seemed to be the saddle and the hunt. A conspiracy was hatched among the three, and the Great Northern War was begun in 1700.

The Danes attacked Holstein-Gottorp, an ally of Sweden ruled by the brother-in-law of Charles; Russians laid siege to Narva in Estonia; Saxons invested Riga in Livonia.

The boy-king of Sweden quickly proved to be a man-sized fighter. Daringly, he led a Swedish fleet across the Sound, landed an army, and threatened to level Copenhagen, the Danish capital. This was enough to bring a

quick capitulation from Frederick IV. After Russia declared war and besieged Narva, Charles led eleven thousand Swedes to relieve the city and attacked thirty-five thousand undisciplined, untrained, Russian barbarians and routed them in the midst of a violent snowstorm. His unorthodox, straight-ahead, offensive tactics overwhelmed the enemy and earned him the sobriquet of "Lion of the North."

Instead of pursuing Tsar Peter to force a capitulation, which Peter seemed willing to concede at this point, Charles led his army into Poland to secure vengeance against Augustus—he must be deposed as King of Poland. Despite numerous victories, it took several years (to 1706) to achieve that goal. Then he turned eastward to deal with Peter.

The Tsar had spent those years trying to westernize Russia. His efforts had borne some fruit, particularly in the case of the army. At least the nucleus of a modern, western-style army had been created. While Charles was chasing the Saxons in Poland with a single-minded purpose, Peter, with an equal though more logical single-mindedness, pounced upon Sweden's Baltic provinces. Russian armies raped Ingria, Estonia and Livonia, and Peter decreed the building of a new capital at the mouth of the Neva. At an untold cost in human agony and death, St. Petersburg rose upon the swampland where a city should never have been built. But the Tsar had a new window on the Baltic.

C

Charles had ignored all this while he tracked Augustus across the plains of Poland for he was confident that, once he had dealt with the Saxon, he could then master the Russian barbarian. Fate was to prove him wrong.

Rested, well-equipped, invincible, the Swedes marched out of Saxony in September 1707. The general plan of operation was to drive the Russians out of Poland, while securing control of the kingdom for King Stanislaus (Charles' choice to replace Augustus), then cross the frontier into Russia and push on along the great road from Smolensk to Moscow. Reinforcements and supplies would be brought from Livonia by General Adam Lewenkaupt, while General George Lybeker advanced from Finland to destroy St. Petersburg. Also, a revolt of the Ukrainian Cossacks was to be ignited by Ivan Mazepa, the Hetman (General) of the Cossacks, who would then join the Swedes in the attack upon the heart of the Tsar's empire.

Charles never reached Moscow.

The campaign, seemingly well planned in its general outline, became a fiasco. The Russians laid waste an area ten times broader than the line of advancing Swedes. Nothing was left for the invader to forage. Lewenkaupt suffered defeat at Lesaia and brought only refugees rather than reinforcements to Charles. The story was much the same with Mazepa.

The direct route to Moscow became impossible. Charles turned southeastwardly to the Ukraine—and inevitably to Poltava and destiny—woeful destiny! From the vineyards of France to the traditionally frozen steppes of Russia, the winter of 1708-09 was uncommonly severe, one of the worst in recorded history. Swedes and Cossacks were decimated by cold and hunger.

Less than half of those who had started out with Charles and Lewenkaupt made up the Swedish army of about

25,000 which stood before the town of Poltava in the spring of 1709; and half of that number were incapacitated by wounds or sickness. Poltava, a small town on the Vorskla, was a Russian supply center. The Swedes had to take it or die.

The battle of Poltava, 8 July 1709, is ranked among the most decisive battles in history. Charles XII, who was seriously wounded in the foot while reconnoitering a few days before the battle, was unable, for the first time in his life, to lead his troops personally in the kind of lightning charge which had brought so many victories. Russians and Swedes hurled themselves into the inferno of battle—and the course of history was changed.

A

Almost one-half of the Swedish combatants on that day were killed, wounded or taken prisoner. The power of Sweden was broken forever; and the door was opened for Russia to become a power in Europe. Poltava placed the hegemony of Northern Europe in Russia's hands. It also destroyed King Stanislaus in Poland and, along with Peter's smothering of the Cossack revolt, sealed Tsarist control of what had been a semi-independent Ukraine. Henceforth, Russia would loom very large in European affairs.


The Swedes fled from their Armageddon with the Russians in close pursuit. Charles and other wounded men were ferried across the Dnieper; the rest of the spent army was to detour through the Crimea and join the King later. But when the Russians appeared the next morning, General Lewenkaupt surrendered without a fight. All was lost, save the King.

After crossing the Dnieper, Charles and his fellow-refugees struggled through extremely difficult terrain until they reached Bender in the USSR but then part of the domain of the Ottoman Turks. Here Charles stayed for over five years as the increasingly unwelcome guest of the Sultan, Ahmed III, while he vainly hoped to reverse Poltava by inducing the Turks to make war upon the Russians while new Swedish forces hopefully advanced through Poland. Both efforts were aborted.

Like the proverbial man who came to dinner, Charles outstayed his welcome in the realm of the Sultan. Hints that he should leave went unheeded. Pleas from Sweden for his return were ignored. Obstinate beyond measure, Charles refused to move. The "Lion of the North" became "Ironhead" to the Turks. The patience and generosity of the Sultan were stretched to the limit; and, after 3-1/2 years' refuge, Charles was ordered to leave the Ottoman Empire. He refused. Some 10,000 Turks and Tartars were ordered to attack his camp at Bender in February 1713. In an encounter fantastic enough to defy fiction, Charles and 50 Swedes fought off the "enemy-host" in what is known as the "Kalabalik."

When he tripped while running from his flaming house, Charles was taken prisoner and transported almost 400 miles to Demotika. A man of indomitable will, he remained abed at Demotika for many months. Though many thought he feigned illness to avoid expulsion, actually the Kalabalik had left him with a broken foot, as well as more visible wounds (part of his nose, part of an ear, and four fingers).

Sweden suffered terribly during the King's prolonged absence. The years 1710 to 1714 saw repeated crop



Charles XII's campaigns and movements.

failures and bubonic plague. Thousands died. The empire disappeared. Augustus, upon hearing of Poltava, resumed his place as King of Poland; and Stanislaus became another royal refugee at Bender. Denmark re-entered the war. A Danish army invaded Scania, the southernmost province of Sweden, in the fall of 1709. The Russians overran Finland and the remaining Swedish strongholds in the Baltic provinces. George of Hanover (who was to become King of Great Britain in 1714) took possession of Verden as a kind of trustee for Sweden but never intended to honor that trust. Bremen also attracted him. Prussia stood anxiously on the sidelines, covetously gazing at Stettin, and was eventually to give in to the temptation and join Sweden's enemies.

All that remained in Swedish hands after 1713 were Stralsund and the island of Rugen in Pomerania and Wismar in Mecklenburg. Charles could have retained some of his lands by negotiating peace with his enemies, but he could not tolerate the thought of a loser's peace.

In direct violation of the King's orders, the perplexed and despairing State Councillors in Stockholm called a Riksdag (parliament) in October 1714. Such was the feeling of many in the country that its Secret Committee considered proposals to negotiate peace without the King

and to establish a regency. Count Arvid Horn, the leader of the State Council, aborted any revolutionary action of this sort. Horn wanted peace as much as any man, and he wanted to end the absolutism of the Crown more than most, but loyalty would not allow him to support illegal procedures even though he agreed with the objectives. The Riksdag sent a new and urgent plea to Charles to return to his kingdom. The message was taken to Demotika by Count Bernard von Lienen, who told the King quite bluntly that, if he did not return, he might well lose his throne. That did it. Charles informed the Sultan that he was ready to depart.



ahmed III was happy to see his unwelcome royal guest make ready to leave, and he showered the Swede with munificent gifts and provided a troop of Janissaries to escort him to the border of the Holy Roman Empire. Cooperation was also forthcoming from the Emperor, Charles VI. The Habsburg ordered provisions prepared at every expected stop on the journey through Hungary and Germany. He was also willing to offer official, imperial hospitality to his fellow monarch, but Charles preferred to travel incognito.

It was a motley party which began the exodus on 2 October 1714. There were Swedes, some of whom had fought beside the King at Narva so long ago; Poles who had supported King Stanislaus and who dared not go home; Cossacks who feared the wrath of Tsar Peter; a number of German, French and other European officers who had entered Charles' service in his exile; diplomatic personnel who had been assigned to the "court" of the refugee king; Jews and Janissaries who had loaned money to the Swedes and who were prepared to travel all the way to Sweden to collect their usurious profits.

Charles' return was as extraordinary as anything else in his incredible career. The caravan was too slow. In late October, Charles left his retinue behind and set out with only two officers. Adopting fictitious names and the guise of minor Swedish officers, the three rode off across Hungary at a relentless pace. One officer could not keep up and was left behind. Charles and the other raced horses by day and coaches by night as they rushed through Austria, Bavaria, Wurtemburg, the Palatinate, Westphalia, and Mecklenburg—a roundabout route to preserve their incognito. Incredibly covering about 1,200 miles in the fortnight after leaving the main body, the King and his companion rode up to the gates of Stralsund in Pomerania. King Charles was again in Swedish territory after an odyssey of more than 14 years.

Quickly the word of Charles' return crossed the sea to Sweden, and the nation went wild with joy. Past and present hardships were forgotten for the moment. All would be well again—or so it was thought. But Charles did not come home to make peace and relieve his people of their burdens. Indeed, he did not go to Sweden proper, but stayed in Stralsund, which was soon under seige by the Danes and Saxons. Little concern did he show for the hardships of his people as he sent orders to Stockholm to raise 20,000 troops to join him in the besieged city.

Sweden longed for peace, cried for peace. Ever since Poltava, the burdens imposed upon the people had been oppressive. The cream of Sweden's young manhood had died on the frozen steppes of Russia in the ill-fated invasion, or fell at Poltava, or languished in Siberian

prisons. Some had been sold into slavery in the Turkish empire or aboard Venetian galleys. Harvests had been bad. Plague had claimed thousands. Good land went uncultivated and fisheries were abandoned for lack of manpower. Foreign trade was reduced to a trickle as the Russians established mastery in the Eastern Baltic and the Danes controlled the Sound. Shortages of raw materials curtailed manufacturing. Soldiers and their horses were quartered on peasants who had difficulty sustaining even themselves.

The military situation became worse. The Russians were ready to join the Danes and Saxons at Stralsund. Prussia, after having waited long as an opportunistic neutral, declared war in the spring of 1715. Hanover joined the allies in October. Division of the spoils was agreed upon: Prussia was to get Stettin and Wolgast in Western Pomerania; Hanover would pay Denmark for the former Swedish bishoprics of Bremen and Verden; and Denmark would hold Pomerania north of the Peene river. Peter the Great already held the Baltic provinces and Augustus was quite secure upon the Polish throne. If the King of Sweden would only recognize these arrangements, the war could end.

The number of enemies did not seem to bother Charles XII. Certain of the righteousness of his cause, he was confident of ultimate success, even though Sweden stood alone.

Stralsund was the strongest fortified city in Pomerania. It was located on the Strelasund, a strait which separated the island of Rugen from the mainland. Stralsund was itself connected with the mainland only by a narrow causeway. Its fortifications were at one time thought to be impregnable but were now in a somewhat weakened condition.

The key to the defense of Stralsund was the sea. So long as supplies could be brought from Sweden, the city could repel attackers who advanced upon the causeway. Swedish and Danish fleets engaged in a six-hour battle off Rugen on 28 July 1715. Both fleets were badly damaged in the indecisive battle. The Danes put into Copenhagen for repairs, and came out again in six weeks. The Swedish ships went into Karlskrona, but did not come out. Charles sent frantic orders to Admiral Sparre to put to sea for, if the enemy gained control of the channels around Rugen, they could easily land forces and take the island. And the fall of Rugen would seal the doom of Stralsund.



ate, which had not smiled upon Charles XII since before Poltava, played more tricks upon him. Each time Admiral Sparre tried to sail into the Baltic the winds were unfavorable. The fleet lay helpless and unhelpful in Karlskrona while doom slowly settled over Rugen and Stralsund.

Rugen fell to the Prussians in November despite daring frontal assaults by the Swedes, led by their fearless king. Charles, with a minor bullet wound of the chest, was among those shipped across the strait to Stralsund. There were not enough boats and the rest had no choice but surrender.

The fall of Stralsund was now but a matter of time. Steady bombardment by the allies shot away part of the city's wall. The outworks of the fortress were captured, recaptured, and finally lost. There was no hope of aid by land or sea. Capitulation or a fight to the death were the

only alternatives. Officers, soldiers and townspeople urged the King to escape while he could. Difficult though it was for Charles to abandon his men, his pride could not bear the humiliation of becoming a prisoner of his hated enemies.

On a dark and stormy night in December, a rowboat plodded its way through the broken ice, bearing its royal passenger toward the island of Hidden See. Near the island, the King transferred to a barge which completed the crossing to Sweden while Stralsund surrendered to the foe. For the first time in more than sixteen years Charles XII set foot on Swedish soil at Trelleborg on 15 December 1715.

P

Prudence might have led Charles to quit after Poltava; acceptance of the obvious should have led him to quit after the fall of Stralsund. (Frederick the Great was later to say that Charles should have committed suicide after Stralsund.) But neither prudence nor resignation had ever characterized Charles XII. Like the tragic figures of old who defied the gods, he continued to challenge fate until that fickle goddess brought the drama to its inexorable end.

The allies expected that the capture of Stralsund would bring an end to the war and a confirmation of their conquests. In Sweden there was much less weeping over the loss of Stralsund than there was hope that this defeat would bring peace and an end to hardships so long endured. Such hopes were crushed by Charles' demands for new troops, more supplies and greater taxes. It was reported that utter despair gripped the exhausted nation. Peasants abandoned their farms and fled into the forests. Men mutilated themselves to avoid conscription. Once well-loved by his people, Charles was now believed by many to be mad.

Still thinking offensively, Charles planned an attack upon Denmark across the frozen Sound in early 1716. Fate again thwarted him by sending a gale to break up the ice. Where could he strike out at his enemies? Norway, which was part of the Danish kingdom, was the only feasible, if not vital, target. An offensive against Norway might at least give an impression of strength to his enemies and bolster his diplomatic position as his Byzantine diplomatic moves sought to divide his enemies by the prospect of a separate and favorable peace to each. The distrust which existed among the allies, especially that between the Tsar and the British King-Hanoverian Elector, made the prospect seem likely.

Norway looked like easy pickings. She had only 20,000 soldiers to defend her frontier of several hundred miles, her storehouses and powder magazines were low, and her administration was incompetent. Winter was a good time for an invasion since frozen rivers would aid rather than impede an invader. On the other hand, the mountainous terrain was advantageous to the defender, and the barren land offered little sustenance to an enemy army. In his haste to launch an offensive, Charles XII neglected to provide adequately for the stomachs of his men; nor did he bring sufficient artillery.

Burning vader on the mountain tops broadcast the alarm of invasion as three Swedish columns crossed the border in February 1716. Leading one force of about 3,000 men, Charles won a few skirmishes and was soon in sight of the Norwegian capital, Khristiania (modern Oslo). The Norwegian commander, General Barthold von Lützow, al-

lowed the Swedes to occupy the town, but he had put three thousand men into the fortress of Akershus, whose guns were trained up Khristiania. Lack of artillery prevented Charles from attacking the fortress, and Norwegian guerillas cut down Swedish foraging parties. Meanwhile, the incompetent General Christian Ascheberg lost a commissariat of four hundred men and a supply of ammunition to the Norwegians and retreated across the border to Sweden.

The continued occupation of Khristiania was untenable, so Charles evacuated the capital after five weeks. The Swedes crossed the Glomma river and fell upon Fredrikshald early in July. The town was taken easily, but again lack of artillery made it impossible to gain the fortress, called Fredriksten. An attempt to storm the fortress was repulsed with heavy losses. Charles blamed "unlucky shots" for the loss of a number of brave officers "whom fate would not permit to live." When the Norwegians put fire to Fredrikshald and a Danish fleet cut off supplies from the sea, Charles came to the unavoidable conclusion that he must withdraw from the country. Failure was difficult for Charles to accept. This failure meant for him that a new effort must be made as soon as he was properly prepared. In the end, victory must be his.

In the meantime, the allies concluded that a showdown with Charles and an end to the war could be obtained only in Sweden itself. The Tsar and the Danish King signed a treaty in June for a combined invasion of Scania, the "breadbasket" of Sweden. Great Britain, technically neutral though her king's Duchy of Hanover was a belligerent, was to send ships to the Sound to "facilitate" the invasion. Twenty thousand Russian troops were shipped from Germany to Denmark for the descent upon Scania.

Before quitting Norway, Charles had sent some troops to Scania as the danger of invasion developed. On his return, the King inspected defenses as he travelled south to Lund, where he established his headquarters early in September. The fortresses in Scania were garrisoned and provisioned. Military depots were established in the towns, and a great store of artillery at Karlskrona was made ready for rapid delivery to any threatened point. Batteries were built along the coast, and 20,000 soldiers were disposed at the most likely landing places. Not only would Charles contest attempted landings, he was also prepared to resort to a scorched earth policy should enemy forces succeed in landing.

I

In mid-August Peter the Great had raised his flag on the Ingria as Grand Admiral of the Russo-Danish fleet. Accompanied by the English, under Admiral Sir John Norris, the fleet proceeded from the Sound to the Isle of Bornholm. It was a mighty armada. The Swedish fleet found it expedient to put into Karlskrona. Norris and Peter wanted to follow and force an engagement, but the Danish admiral refused. Though there were 53,000 Russians and Danes poised for the operation, the invasion never came off.

The bonds which held the allies together were of gossamer. Each sought its own advantage. The destruction of Sweden's empire and power had raised a new and more menacing threat—Russia. Russian troops in central Europe made princes uncomfortable. The prospect of Russian domination of the Baltic made Great Britain nervous. Denmark had scuttled the attack upon

Karlskrona because she wished to avoid losses to her fleet. Prussia and Hanover were at odds. And personalities clashed. Peter resented George of Hanover, whose newly gained British crown seemed to exacerbate his arrogance. Coldness developed between Peter and Frederick IV of Denmark when the Tsar was a guest at the Danish court during the summer.

"D-day" was to have been 21 September. Four days before the invasion date, the Tsar announced that it was too late in the season; it would have to be postponed until the following year. The Danes and English protested vainly.



Fate had at last smiled upon Charles XII. More than fate, however, had brought this welcome escape from the destruction of Charles' throne and kingdom. His defensive measures had been sound, and his army was steadily increasing in numbers and strength. The Russians had observed the Swedish defenses and saw some risk in the venture. Peter may have feared a campaign whose outcome was uncertain.

Though the invasion threat evaporated, Charles remained at Lund because he would not go to Stockholm until he had vanquished his enemies. He spent almost two years in Lund while Baron Frederick von Görtz, a skillful diplomat, tried to bring about peace by dividing the allies.

By June 1718, the efficacy of Görtz' methods had raised an army of 65,000 and Charles set out to reverse his country's fortunes in the crucible of war in Norway. Charles divided his main force into three units which advanced from Värmland, Dalsland and Bohuslän. With the aid of Emmanuel Swedenborg, a noted scientist with whom the King had discussed mathematics and mechanics at Lund, Charles had devised a system to transport galleys overland for twelve miles from Stromsted to Idefjord. The Swedish flotilla then blockaded its Norwegian counterpart and forced the Danes to quit their defenses at Svinessund and pull back beyond the Glomma river. All did not go so well as this, however. An advance force, under command of General Karl Armfelt, wasted away in a blockade around Trondhjem, whose walls proved too strong to be taken by assault. The main army was greeted by rain rather than by frozen rivers. There were shortages of food and clothing. Bad water and fatigue harassed the invaders. Within a month 2,000 men had taken sick and died.

The Army advanced to Fredrikshald, whose mighty fortress, Fredriksten, had denied Charles victory two years before. Fredrikshald was the key to Norway; Charles was determined to seize that key. Headquarters were established in the village of Tistedal, but Charles usually took his meals and slept in a small wooden hut which he had built close to the trenches which were being dug in front of Fredriksten.

Fredriksten was garrisoned by 1,500 men and was well provisioned. It had three outworks, named Overberget, Mellomberget and Gyldenlove. On 27 November, Charles led 200 grenadiers in storming Gyldenlove. The King

himself put ladders to the wall and was the second man over the rampart.

The Swedes continued their advance toward the fortress itself. Under cover of night the trenchers dug into the hard earth. Parallel. Forward. Parallel. Closer and closer. Dig, dig, dig. Parallel. Forward. Parallel. Closer and closer.

Sunday, 30 November 1718, First Sunday of Advent. Divine Services in morning and afternoon. According to some, there were strange things that day: King Charles changed his clothes—in the midst of a siege; the King was ill at ease; he sorted papers, destroyed some; he made unusually garrulous farewells to officers after a council of war; he promoted his cook to the rank of chief cook and ordered the papers of appointment be prepared immediately.

The King ate supper in his little hut, then went through the trenches to the forwardmost parallel. The trenchers were at work on a new trench which, after running forward a distance, cut a sharp angle to begin a new parallel. Charles climbed the side of the last parallel to observe the progress of the sapping. His head and arms were above the trench and his body rested on its sloping side. Perhaps this was his way of encouraging the soldiers in the trench to face danger.

The Fredriksten garrison hung burning pitch-wreaths on the walls and shot fireballs to illuminate the Swedes in the trenches. Musket shots rang through the night air. Officers begged the King to remove himself from so dangerous a place. One officer reminded him that a musket ball had as little respect for a King as for a common soldier. The warnings could not move the warrior king who had so many times faced death in leading assaults against his enemies.



At about 9:30 P.M. a dull thud was heard by the officers in the trench below Charles. Looking up, they saw that the King's head had slumped to his chest; his left arm hung limply by his side; the rest of his body lay motionless against the sloping side of the trench. Death had been instantaneous. The bullet had entered his left temple, tore its way through his brain, and blasted an exit for itself on the right side.

The epic was ended. Charles XII had defied the verdict of history delivered at Poltava. His effort had been heroic, his reward failure. Foresight, prudence, resignation are virtues not easily worn by heroes. And Charles XII was a hero—indeed a hero stranger than fiction. His career was part Norse saga and part Greek tragedy. His fame after 250 years is that of a fearless and unconquerable spirit who had won great victories and suffered one irreversible defeat which changed the course of history. Poltava opened the West to Russia. Fredriksten was but a tragic postscript to that historic battle. It was the end of the epic of Charles XII, King of Sweden—Lion of the North or Madman of the North?

Mr. McCarthy is an associate professor of history at the college.

The "World Champs" From La Salle

By John Rodden, '78



Brother Alfred (center, foreground) with the championship debaters of 1933-34

Gather an alumni group of La Salle aficionados in a room and begin nonchalantly to reminisce aloud about the triumphantly shining moment in College annals, the image of utter glory frozen in your photographic memory as the Camelot of the Conquering Explorers.

I guarantee you that your pleasant reveries will soon be broken by the sharp reality of indignant, combative voices.

Recent grads with memories no longer than mine will recall the graceful arc of a Joe Bryant hook shot swishing its way to a 1975 Big Five basketball title; older enthusiasts will visualize the raw power of an unstoppable two-hand Ken Durrett dunk shot ramming its way to a near-undefeated 1969 season; track fans will muse upon the whirring airborne legs of an Ira Davis leaping to the long jump's final round in the 1960 Rome Olympics or John Uelses' supple fiberglass pole catapulting him in 1964 to the first sixteen-foot pole vault in history; swimming historians will simply see a young man with an Olympic gold medal hanging from his neck, 1948 200-meter breaststroke champion Joe Verdeur; and still others will stridently insist that the grandeur of La Salle is compressed into the immortal trajectory of a seeing-eye Tom Gola

jumper miraculously finding its way to yet another basket or two unforgettable national titles.

To be sure, these are the athletic highlights of La Salle history. But veteran historians whose memories stretch back before the war to La Salle A.D. ("Anni Disjiciendi," "In the Years of the Throwing Down," i.e. LSC tackle football) remember a team of "world champs." It was not a team of athletes, but in its heyday it had more recruits than the football, basketball, or swimming teams. Yes, the debate isn't over until one mentions the original La Salle Debating Society.

No national or international organization existed to recognize officially its remarkable string of successes. But the Debating Society (today the Gavel Society) of the mid-1930's met and defeated many of the most renowned universities in America and Great Britain. The debaters themselves readily concede that they are tempted to romanticize the past and that their memories fade when they are asked to think of faces and places from 45 years ago. No one even remembers how the Debating Society became named the Gavel Society or who began the rumor of the "world champion" debaters. But whether the myth

was instigated by proud La Sallians or impressed victims, incoming Society members were by 1940 being told about the "golden age" of Society debate that had recently ended. And perhaps it was the World War which snuffed out even the memory of the myth itself.

Harvey, Flubacher, Crawford, McCauley, Hutzell, Liederbach, Grady, Waltrich—they're not the 1927 Yankees' Murderers Row, but they were among the star performers of those early squads.

"They were outstanding speakers and sharp debaters," recalls Joseph Gembala '41, a Philadelphia attorney and LSC law instructor, who received the 1939 Society medal for best speaker. "I don't know how the 'champion' rumor got started, but I remember hearing it often. Sure, it wasn't official, since we had no 'league' beyond the city finals to determine winners—but it wasn't untrue either. For a couple of years, our teams beat or tied every team we faced, some of the finest around."

Eugene Fitzgerald, associate professor of philosophy and a 1950's debater, also recalls hearing about the 1930's teams. "I heard often that for three years in the 30's we had teams which took on the world and distinguished themselves," he says. "It was something for us to look up to."

The debaters of those times believe the peak years were 1936-38. The January 15, 1937 *Collegian* lists the scheduled opponents for the upcoming spring, against whom La Salle would go undefeated: Harvard, Yale, Johns Hopkins, Temple, University of Pennsylvania, Lehigh, Syracuse, Princeton, Cornell, Brown, New York University, Bucknell, Columbia, Washington and Lee, Swarthmore, Boston University, and an old rival, St. Joseph's. Oxford and Cambridge were later added to the list. While a few of the debates were declared "no decision" contests by the presiding judging panels, the Society did not lose a single one.

But Daniel McCauley '38, Society president in 1936-37 and one of the most eloquent Explorer debaters ever, is quick to disavow the name *champion*. "I don't think we ever assumed that title," he says with a laugh. "But we did have a formidable schedule and I don't ever remember our losing a debate in those years. But they were individual competitions—there really was no formal way to determine a champion in those days."

Still, Gembala makes a point that none of the members dispute.

"This much you can say about those years," he insists. "From 1934-41 under Brother Alfred (Society moderator from 1932-41) La Salle was the premier debating team in Philadelphia and the best Catholic college in the East."

Anthony Waltrich '39, a former director of alumni relations and Evening Division English instructor, who is now retired, echoes Gembala's judgement. "We really did have a feeling that we were the top team competing," he says. "But while that sounds fine to say among ourselves, I know it doesn't sound so fine on paper. Still, we were the equivalent of national champions—we defeated all the best teams of the time."

If the claims sound bold or perhaps embroidered by the passage of time, the 1935 *Collegian*, urging the student body to throw its support behind the team, reinforces it on paper: "La Salle wins this debate, La Salle wins that debate . . . La Salle, a college outstandingly famous in collegiate circles for extraordinary debating. But to La

Salle students, what do they mean? . . . the chief interest of every debating team, the main incentive, is the same as any other of the College's teams: to further the glory and renowned reputation of La Salle."

And with more than forty students trying out for the 1937 team (more than for the football squad) and more than 150 (half the student body) sometimes squeezing into the auditorium (today's chapel), in College Hall to watch the matches, debating rarely lacked support.

"The stage was located where the memorial to John Kennedy now rests," says Dr. Joseph Flubacher '35, Society co-founder and second president, now a professor of economics. "I remember one day in 1935 when we had a debate there, against Penn, another against them at Penn, and a basketball game in Wister Hall against Penn. There was a real rivalry between us—and when we won all three, a pandemonium broke out."

"And it was always a big bone of contention as to who would judge," continues Flubacher, often chosen as best speaker in matches. "You could rarely please both sides—either the judges were called partisan or poorly qualified. I suppose the same controversy exists today."

"The student body was so interested in our debates because there weren't many competing activities as you have today," observes Joseph Grady '40, the 1938 Society President who is now professor of communications at St. Charles Seminary. "We had football, basketball and debate. Everybody likes to see and root for a winner, and usually we were the winningest of the three."

Harry Liederbach, '38 a partner in the Bucks County Law firm of Liederbach, Eimer and Rossi, agrees that the Society commanded an unusual degree of attention for a non-athletic activity. "Two extracurriculars had chief prominence in those years," he says. "Debate and football—and sometimes in that order. The Philadelphia papers would all report on the debates, even interviewing us or Brother Alfred. As far as recalling specific debates or opponents, well, that's a long time ago. But I do remember clearly that it was hard work and satisfying but difficult to balance with our academic load."

So successful had the Debating Society become by 1937 that it began to branch out from its intercollegiate competitions into the Philadelphia radio networks and that year established the La Salle Radio Forum on Station WHAT. It aired intramural and intercollegiate debates and dramatic readings from 2 to 3 every Saturday afternoon and was soon supplemented by the Radio Broadcast Council of LSC on Station WDAS at 8 p.m. Sundays. Listeners sent questions or comments to the stations after the programs and the debaters responded in the following week.

"The radio shows worked well for the College and for the stations," recalled Frank Hutzell, 1939 Society president and class valedictorian, before his death last spring. "The College wanted to attract attention for academic activities and to get more students, and the station needed different types of programming. It really got our name around."

Advertised as "the champion debaters," recalls Waltrich, The Society also began speaking to community groups such as the Holy Name Society and the Sierra Club, sometimes travelling as far away as Pottstown or Coatesville.

"We'd sometimes get audiences of 300 or more in the really packed houses," says Waltrich. "As with the radio



Coach John Grady (center) with the college's 1966 State Debating champions (from left): Jim Butler, Gerry Dzura, Tom Witt, and Jim Gillece.

shows, it was good practice for us, a service to the community and excellent public relations for the College."

Yet despite the debaters' growing national reputation and broadening range of activities, their chief interest remained in local intercollegiate debate and the rivalries with St. Joseph's and Penn, kept alive by the annual Philadelphia Intercollegiate Debate League finals. Founded in 1934, with the late Norman Harvey '34 (first Society president) as secretary, the League was dominated by La Salle until it folded in 1937. It was resurrected in 1941 as the Philadelphia Forensic League, but with America's entry into the war, intercollegiate competition dried up. But La Sallians continued to debate, both for the fun of preparing speeches and from the desire to see issues clarified through dialogue.

"We won consistently throughout the thirties—but the emphasis was never so much on winning as with sincerely striving for 'the truth,'" recalled Hutzell. "Brother Alfred wanted you to believe what you said. There was a tremendous fervor on those teams, especially against St. Joe's and Penn, but it was all very professional and always impartial. We even rented tuxedos for the most important debates. And at one Yale debate, despite the fact that the judge was a Yale man, he *still* gave us the decision."

The debaters remember Brother Alfred fondly and vividly, with his small, piercing steel blue eyes overcropped by a full white beard that gave him an almost forbidding appearance. But his coaching style was earnest and hard-working.

"The enthusiasm of Brother Alfred stands out in my mind above everything else," said Hutzell. "He was the guiding influence on all of us. He wasn't a young man, but

he was always an active, energetic coach."

"An inspiration," says Albert Crawford '36 a partner in the Delaware County legal firm of Crawford, Graham, & Higgins, of his moderator. "Brother Alfred was an exceedingly competent coach. He taught you how to express yourself convincingly. We delved into the debate topics with a blind enthusiasm and he channeled our drive.

The debate format of the 30's was very different from the dominant intercollegiate style and practice today. There were three, rather than two, men on each side and each debater spoke for ten minutes in his opening presentation and for five minutes in his rebuttal. Questions from the floor followed the speeches, but there was no cross-examination until 1941. Rather than debate one topic throughout the year and develop sophisticated technical arguments supported by massive statistical evidence (like an attorney presenting a case, as in today's format), the debaters spoke more in layman's terms and appealed to the general audience as much as to the judges, as in British parliamentary debate. And, of course, the judges themselves were rarely professors of speech or communication. They were usually interested faculty and well-informed members of the community.

A survey of the debate resolutions serves as a sort of running commentary of the burning issues of the times, and some of them have a surprisingly modern ring. "Should we adopt socialized medical aid?" (1933), "Is recognition of Russia appropriate because of economic priorities?" (1934), "Should all nations prevent the shipment of arms?" (1935), "Should Congress be empowered to overturn Supreme Court decisions holding Federal legislation unconstitutional?" (1936), "Should a

one-house legislature be adopted?" (1937), "Should Women Work?" (1939), "Should the federal government regulate by law all labor unions?" (1941), "Should the U.N. establish an international Board of Justice and provide a police force to protect the world?" (1942).

In the late 1940's, a national debating organization was created to determine national rankings. This makes comparisons between accomplishments of the debaters before and after the War difficult. In any case, the outstanding achievements of the 30's debaters should not obscure the accomplishments of the excellent teams of the 50's and 60's.

"The times were so different between us and them," observes Fitzgerald, who later served as a debater coach. "We were told of their accomplishments and it gave us incentive. We'd say, 'We'll make people forget about those guys—and we were also successful!'"

Indeed they were. Fitzgerald, 1951 class valedictorian, and Richard Stout '51, today a Philadelphia U.S. attorney, placed in the top ten in the National Invitational Debate Tournament in their senior years. An even prouder moment for Fitzgerald was his capture of first place in the tournament in dramatic reading and teammate Daniel Goldberg's second place finish in after-dinner speaking.

"I used Washington Irving's 'Westminster Abbey' as my reading—and walked into the room and pulled down the shades to get a gloomy, shadowy effect," he says with a laugh. "I guess it worked."

Fitzgerald also confirms that the old Penn rivalry was still alive in the 50's, especially one day in 1950 when Stout and he faced (at La Salle) "two whip-smart, supremely confident Penn boys who thought they had us beat before the debate began." "We won," he says with a bemused smile, still savoring the victory, "and I can still see the proud looks on some of the older Brothers. But, "he says with a pause, "our opponents haven't done too badly for themselves since." The defeated were none other than Pennsylvania Senator-Elect Arlen Specter and Harvard theologian Harvey Cox, author of *The Secular City*.

"Our teams in those days were always eager to excel so as to prove ourselves," continues Fitzgerald, who served as moderator for seven years between 1953-60. "We wanted to prove that our best was equal to anyone's best. We felt in the position of little men with great drive—we wanted to put La Salle 'on the map,' to show that we were more than a basketball program. I think we simply had more drive than most of our opponents—it was as though we were defending La Salle's honor."

John Grady, director of the Honors Center and associate professor of economics, recalls the 1966 State Championship as the highlight of the 60's and his coaching years (1963-67). The team included present-day attorneys Jim Gillece and Tom Witt, businessman Jerry Dzura and LSC English professor Jim Butler.

"Our teams had a national itinerary—we'd fly each year to Notre Dame, Harvard, Tulane, Navy and other places—you could go, as in golf tourneys, if you were invited—so it was a real plum to gain an invitation," says Grady. "Debating's great value to the College was that it brought our name into a circle of people different from basketball's. Teams first met us and said, 'Oh you're the college of the matchbooks.' Two months later, they'd say, 'Oh you're the college with the debaters.' And the program brought many fine students to La Salle, students who have maintained their ties over the years with us."

"As for me as a coach," he continues, "the job helped me know what the college undergraduate was thinking. I was better able to relate to them and therefore a better teacher in the classroom. And my debaters were exceptionally good people—it was a joy and a pleasure to work with them."

Yet the greatest benefits from debating have doubtless accrued not to the college or coaches but to the debaters themselves. "Confidence," said Hutzell. "Debate breeds it." "A thinking tool," says Liederbach. "I made it my career, didn't I?" says Joe Gembala with a grin, expressing the sentiments of many former debaters who are now attorneys or teachers or in other fields in which communication skills are so central that the careers almost seem to them like professional forensics.

"We'd prove socialism was evil one week and the next show how it was so good the Pope would endorse it," continues Gembala jokingly. "It was great fun, especially against Rosemont and Immaculata. You were supposed to act the gentleman against the 'ladies.' But I'll tell you once those debates started, winning was our objective—we'd be gracious after the debate."

Liederbach recalls his forensic encounters with the gentler sex with similar delight and notes that debating was one of the few opportunities for men and women from single-sex colleges to meet on other than a social basis. "Debating the women's colleges was a different world from what you have today. We were coming from an all-male environment and were used to courting—not competing with—girls. I think it was good for both sexes to see each other in that different setting. They were shocked a bit at our intensity—they looked at the debates like meetings. But we never gave much ground."

Yet, occasionally, whether the "gallantry" issued from the debaters or judges, the ladies prevailed. One such quixotic instance is reported by the 1942 *Collegian*: "The Immaculata College Debating Team met La Salle's debaters on Tuesday and the decision was placed in the hands of a jury of nine ladies from Immaculata and nine males, one a gentleman, from La Salle. The nine ladies from Immaculata voted for their favorite club. Eight men from La Salle turned in their decisions in kind. One gentleman, however, cast a draw vote and the decision went to Immaculata."

Whether such decisions be *politesse* or prejudice, they perhaps illustrate in a more serious vein what John Grady means when he talks about the "less obvious" benefits of the debating experience: "gaining an appreciation of one's limitations and learning to deal with others' subjectivities."

"Unlike athletics," he points out, "debate decisions are something out of the competitor's control. Not always the best people win. Not always the most competent or objective people judge. To some extent, your fate lies not with yourself, but in other people's hands. You also must decide whether to play to the predispositions of the judges if you know them, or stand your ground. Later, in your career, you will sometimes be evaluated when things are not entirely within your control and the assessment will sometimes be negative. How will you cope? Debate prepares you to cope. It helps you find for yourself the line between compromising to achieve consensus and dying with your principles. And it sometimes even teaches a little humility."

Mr. Rodden, one of the best debaters in the college's history, is a graduate student at the University of Virginia.

Around Campus



President Carter greets Rachel Phillips as her sisters, Susan and Angela, and her dad, Joseph, watch.

The Day The President Came To Our House

Dr. Joseph M. Phillips, who has been teaching English in the college's Evening Division for 22 years, came up with the ultimate excuse to cancel his Literature course one night in October.

"Sorry, kids," he told his 25 students,

"The President is dropping in on Thursday!"

President Carter did indeed stop in to visit Phillips, his wife, Bertha, and their nine children at their home in Lansdowne. The occasion was one of the folksy "town

meetings" that characterized the type of campaigning and "reaching the people" that he enjoyed the most during his term in the White House.

According to published reports, Carter's campaign aides selected the Phillips family

WOMEN NATIONAL CHAMPS

La Salle's field hockey team won the AIAW national Division II title on November 22 by defeating the defending national champions, S.W. Missouri State, 3-2. It was the college's first national championship in 26 years and the first national title for a La Salle women's team. Full details will appear in the spring issue of *La Salle*.

Philadelphia's First National Collegiate Championship Team arrives home.



1970 U.S. COLLEGIATE FIELD HOCKEY

home for the presidential visit because it was located in Delaware County reasonably close to Philadelphia International Airport, where Air Force I arrived, and fairly close to the Fairmount Hotel, Carter's next stop where he attended a fund-raiser. The Phillips apparently met the other criteria established by Carter's staff—a large middle-class Roman Catholic family with a neat, large back yard located on a street with a nice, old-fashioned nostalgic American look to it.

"It was a very interesting experience," says Phillips, who is the chairman of the English Department at Philadelphia's Thomas Edison High School. "The president displayed himself in very human terms. Up close he is a very nice guy, genuine and unpretentious. You could tell by the way he would talk to the kids. He actually *listened* to their answers."

Although White House officials, campaign aides, Secret Service agents, and telephone company employees became fixtures at the Phillips residence for about five days before the president's visit, Phillips says that it's hard to describe his feelings about being selected to play a part in history that very few of us will ever experience.

"Initially there was a strong feeling of disbelief," he recalls. "Just before he came I was very nervous. It was hard to imagine this is happening to me. But at the moment when he was finally coming toward us, it became a genuinely exciting, heart-thumping experience."

Campaign officials apparently were determined to make sure Carter's visit was not a political showcase. Phillips' neighborhood, in fact, is staunchly Republican, "Reagan country," he says, and most of the hundred or so guests were Republicans. Mrs. Phillips is a Democratic committeewoman who worked as a volun-

teer for Congressman Robert Edgar, the only one in the Presidential party that day (including Senatorial candidate Peter Flaherty) who would survive November's election.

"I was definitely not a Carter setup," says Phillips. "None of the questions (asked by guests) were what you would consider 'soft.' Carter, in fact, seemed surprised by the size of the crowd (estimated at about 6,000 outside the house). He was buoyed up by the reaction of the crowd. He seems not to realize that he is the President of the United States."

It was one of Phillips' sons, Joseph M. Jr., '77, a Ph.D. candidate at Notre Dame, who asked the question that generated the most newsworthy item to come out of the Presidential visit. Replying to young Joe's question regarding the policies of the Federal Reserve Board, Carter criticized the Federal agency—something he had never done in public, which the wire services emphasized in its national coverage.

Phillips says that everyone was quite impressed by Carter's presence.

"Carter really was quite effective in that environment," he recalled. "His intensity came across as genuine, inciting confidence rather than fear. He had a genuine conviction about what he was saying, a deeply-felt conviction about his experience as president, how he had grown and learned in the office."

What was the reaction of Phillips students to the Presidential visit?

"My La Salle students were very much interested in how I felt being in such close proximity to the president," says Phillips. "There was a renewed realization throughout our discussion about the extraordinary almost profound quality of the presidency. My high school students responded differently. They weren't that awestruck about President Carter but they were quite im-

pressed that I was on TV.

"Later, however, when the poor guy went under so badly on election day, some of my students tried to make a causal connection."


President's Associates Adds Nine New Members

Nine prominent business, educational, and communications professionals have been appointed to La Salle's President's Associates, it was announced by Brother Patrick Ellis, F.S.C., Ph.D.

Named to serve three-year terms on the advisory board were: Raymond A. Berens, economics editor of the *Philadelphia Bulletin*; Dr. George diPilato, superintendent, District 5, School District of Philadelphia; Frank J. Ferro, Esq., '69, Deckert, Price and Rhoads, Philadelphia, and Charles M. Lodovico, executive vice president, Lewis & Gilman, Inc., Philadelphia.

Also: James E. McCloskey, '70, economist, City of Philadelphia; John F. McKeogh, '64, director of corporate communications, Rohm and Haas Co., Philadelphia; Daniel Morris, '49, executive vice president, Continental Bank, Norristown; Albert R. Pezzillo, '59, president, consumer products group and executive vice president, Warner-Lambert, Morris Plains, N.J., and Frank J. Scully, '49, vice president, marketing services, American Management Associations, New York City.

These appointees join a group of 35 prominent men and women who work with various La Salle administrators and faculty to enhance curricular offerings, to enrich the cultural life of the college, and to enable the institution to play a more active role in the development of the area.



Thomas J. McCauley, '58 (center), coordinator of the first annual Philadelphia Antiquarian Book Fair sponsored by the Alumni Association in September, checks display with Lee Temares, of Plandome, N.Y., one of the exhibitors, and John J. Fallon, '67, alumni chairman of the highly-successful event.

SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES

'49

Carmen F. Guarino, president of the Water Pollution Control Federation, was awarded the WPCF's Philip F. Morgan Medal.

'50

Richard H. Becker is Special Education administrator in Philadelphia's District 7. **Lewis P. Goelz** has been assigned to the Department of State as deputy assistant secretary for overseas citizens services.

'53

Albert J. Momorella, principal of Marshall Street Elementary School in the Norristown, Pa. school district, has been named Pennsylvania's Elementary Principal of the Year. **Robert J. Posatko, M.D.**, was elected president of the medical staff of Roxborough Memorial Hospital, in Philadelphia.

'54

John G. Carnilla recently retired from the Comly School after 26 years as a teacher in the Philadelphia School District.

'56

Joseph Woll is chairman of the English and Language Arts department at Upper Moreland High School.

'58



Edward S. Devlin

Edward S. Devlin, president of Devlin Associates, Inc., in King of Prussia, Pa., was the primary speaker at seminars on disaster recovery planning held this past Fall in Valley Forge and San Francisco.

'59

Thomas C. Cook has been elected an assistant vice president of Dollar Savings Bank of New York. **Edward Markowski, Ph.D.**, was one of two faculty recipients of East Carolina University's 1980 Alumni Association Outstanding Teacher Awards.

'60

Bela Kerecz is a pollution abatement engineer in Bethlehem Steel Corporation's research department, Bethlehem, Pa. **Edward Kreuser** has been assigned to the Department of State as associate director of visa services.

'61

George A. Carroll is director of the Center for Computer and Management Services at Rutgers University.

'62


Edmond F. McDowell

Edmund F. McDowell, a resident agent for the United States Secret Service, has been chosen to head the newly established Resident Agency in Corpus Christi, Texas.

'63



James J. Clark

James J. Clark has been appointed supervising auditor of contracts auditing for Armco,

in Middletown, Ohio. **Joseph L. Folz** has been appointed supervisor of Harleysville Insurance Company's branch office in Moorestown, N.J. **Richard W. Serfass** has been appointed principal of Johnson Elementary School in Cherry Hill, N.J. He has also been named combat support squadron commander in a New Jersey Air National Guard unit in Atlantic City, N.J.

'64

Joseph E. McCullough was recently promoted to international sales manager of the American Meter Division of the Singer Company, Philadelphia. **Peter L. Viscusi, Ph.D.**, is an assistant professor of history at Central Missouri State University.

'65

Louis DeVicaris, a Cheltenham High School chemistry teacher, has been named 1981 Pennsylvania Teacher of the Year by the State Education Department.

'66

Sam Sandella, associate manager in the group claim east division of Prudential Insurance Company's Central Atlantic home office in Fort Washington, Pa., has recently earned the industry's chartered life underwriter designation.

MARRIAGE: **Michael Wiedemer** to Irene Zubyk.

'67

Bruno Bromke is an assistant professor of Microbiology at Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine. **Augustine E. Moffitt, Jr., Sc.D.**, is manager of environmental health for Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Pa. **Thomas F. Pralss**, who was recently granted the professional designation of Certified Financial Planner by the College for Financial Planning in Denver, Co., was promoted to senior estate planning officer in the Estate and Financial Planning Division of the Girard Bank Trust Department.

'68

James F. Collins, Esq., was recently made a partner in the Freehold, N.J. law firm of

Marks, Holland, LaRosa & Collins. **Richard C. Tomczak** has been assigned as account representative of Union Carbide Corporation's Coatings Materials Division in Danbury, Ct.



Richard C. Tomczak

'69

Albert P. Federico has been named resident vice president of Wohlreich & Anderson Group Limited's King of Prussia, Pa. branch. BIRTH: to **William Bradshaw** and his wife, Elaine, '60, a daughter, Lesley Ashton.

'70

Michael J. Paquet has been appointed registrar of Thomas Jefferson University's College of Allied Health Sciences, in Philadelphia. **John Wroblewski** has been named an assistant professor in the Department of Business at Villa Maria College in Erie, Pa. BIRTH: to **Charles R. Black, Jr.**, and his wife, Nancy, a son, Steven Charles.

'71



William A. Wachter

William A. Wachter has been promoted to staff chemist at the Exxon Research and Development Laboratories in Baton Rouge, La.

'72

Joseph V. Brogan was awarded the Political Science Lee Strauss Memorial Award for best dissertation in political theory for 1978-79, at the University of Notre Dame. **Christopher R. Wogan, III, Esq.**, was elected to the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives for the 176th District.

MARRIAGE: **Raymond J. Lublejewski** to Dolores A. Roehrig. BIRTH: to **Wayne Romanczuk** and his wife, Pat, a daughter, Kelly Ann.

'73

Joseph D. Sette has been named head basketball coach at Bishop McDevitt High School, Wynnote, Pa.

'75

Dwight Evans was elected to the Pennsylvania State House of Representatives for the 203rd District. **Kevin D. Kelly, Esq.**, has been appointed as an assistant district attorney of Sussex County, N.J. **Dennis M. O'Dowd** has been appointed cargo manager for Northwest Orient Airlines at John F. Kennedy Airport in



Michael N. Scavuzzo

New York. **Michael N. Scavuzzo** has been named assistant vice president of agency training and development for Atlas Van Lines, Inc., in Evansville, In.

BIRTHS: to **Kathleen Sulpizio Fields** and her husband, Michael, a son, Jeffrey Michael; to **John A. Skorupa** and his wife, Mary, a son, John Andrew.

'76

Carol DiBattiste, a senior at Temple Law School and president of the Student Bar Association, was recently promoted to the rank of captain in the U.S. Air Force. **Marianne McGettigan Walker** received her juris doctor degree from Villanova University School of Law. **Shahab Minassian** received his M.D. degree from University of Thomas Jefferson School of Medicine and is currently serving a first year residency at Abington Hospital, in Abington, Pa.

MARRIAGES: **Robert E. Coyle, Jr.**, to Jane Wind; **Thomas P. Kelly** to Dena M. Hartman; **Ann S. Pappas** to Kenneth J. O'Neil; **Michael Rupp** to Louise Giannattasio, '78.

'78

Janice MacAvoy, an entertainer who frequently appears at various clubs throughout the Delaware Valley, recently released her first record, "Written in the Stars."

MARRIAGES: **Louise Giannattasio** to Michael Rupp, '76; **Frank A. Toto** to Darleen Mastzro.

'79

David M. Twer



Herbert K. Brown is a seventh grade English teacher at Berlin Community School in Berlin, N.J. **David M. Twer** is a freshman medical student at The Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital, Philadelphia.

MARRIAGE: **Daniel F. Poisenberg** to Pandora Rider.

BIRTH: to **Maryellen T. Kueny** and her husband, **Donald Ronglone**, '79, a son, Christopher.

'80

Dennis A. Pone has been named manager of A.J. Pone's Opticians' Mercerville, N.J. office. MARRIAGE: **Linda Muller** to Larry S. Ulrich. BIRTH: to **Elaine A. Bradshaw**, and her husband, **William**, '69, daughter Lesley Ashton.

GRADU-EIGHTS ACTIVITIES

La Salle College's GRADU-EIGHTS Crew Alumni has a number of events scheduled for the spring of 1981 including an Alumni-Varsity Cheat & Sprint Race at 1:00 P.M., Sunday, April 5, at the Malta Boat Club, and a Dad Vail Day Reunion on Saturday, May 9, at the 500 meter mark on the Schuylkill.

Highlighting Alumni-Varsity Day activities will be the christening of a four-oared shell, the "Tom 'Bear' Curran."

For information call Ken Shaw, '64, at (215) 425-7500, or Jim Scanlin, '76, at (215) 446-0737.

Four Parties for GRADU-EIGHTS representing various age groups are also scheduled in the spring. For further information call or write GRADU-EIGHTS, 34 Old Army Road, Bernardsville, NJ 07924, or call (201) 885-1500.

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

'48

Joseph C. Sabato, D.O., recently opened an office for family practice in Cresson, Pa.

'51

Frank D. DeGeorge has been appointed the U.S. Department of Energy's principal deputy assistant secretary for conservation and solar energy.

'56

Charles J. Heiser, former general sales manager at KYW Newsradio in Philadelphia, has joined radio station KOAX-FM, in Dallas, Texas, as general manager.

'57

Michael Pilla has been promoted to executive relations manager of Hiram Walker Incorporated's Eastern Pennsylvania territory.

'58

Joseph T. McGough has been promoted to vice president at Fidelity Bank.

'59

Norman E. Oelschlegel has been named director of the Banking Bureau of Pennsylvania's Department of Banking, Harrisburg.

Superior of Sacred Heart Home Receives La Salle's Highest Alumni Award

Sister Mary Luke, O.P., Superior of Philadelphia's Sacred Heart Home For Incurable Cancer, has been named the 39th annual recipient of the Signum Fidei Medal, La Salle College's highest alumni award.

Sister Luke accepted the award on behalf of her order, the Dominican Sisters, Congregation of St. Rose of Lima, at the Alumni Association's annual awards dinner on November 21, in the College Union Ballroom on campus.

At the same time, some 67 men and women from the college's day and evening divisions were inducted into the Alpha Epsilon Alumni Honor Society in recognition of their academic and extra-curricular excellence.

Sister Mary Luke's order, otherwise known as the Servants of Relief,

devote their lives to the needy victims of incurable cancer. The Sacred Heart Home, which is commemorating its 50th anniversary this year, is one of five hospital/homes conducted by the Sisters in the United States.

The Signum Fidei Medal derives its name from the motto of the Brothers of the Christian Schools—"Sign of Faith." It is given to an individual who has made "most noteworthy contributions to the advancement of humanitarian principals in keeping with the Christian tradition."

Previous recipients include Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, R. Sargent Shriver, Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, and, last year, the Rev. Aloysius Schwartz, founder and director of Korean Relief, Inc.



John J. French, '53 (right), receives John Finley Memorial Award for outstanding service to the alumni from Terence K. Heaney, '63, president of the college's Alumni Association, as Dr. Peter J. Finley, '53, watches.



John J. Zaccaria, '53 (right), presents certificates to new inductees into Alpha Epsilon Alumni Honor Society: (from left): Brother Lewis Mullin, F.S.C., the college's director of admissions; Brother Gerard Molyneaux, F.S.C., Ph.D., '58, coordinator of the college's communications program; John J. French, '53; Terence K. Heaney, '63, and Richard H. Becker, '50.



Sister Anita, O.P. (right), of the Sacred Heart Home, receives Signum Fidei Medal from Brother President Patrick Ellis, F.S.C., Ph.D., (center), and Alumni Association President Terence K. Heaney, (left).

'61



Timothy J. Coonahan

Timothy J. Coonahan has been named a consultant in the systems development division of Bethlehem Steel Corporation's accounting department in Bethlehem, Pa.

'62



Thomas Z. Gheen

Thomas C. Gheen has been named a partner in the CPA firm of Stockton Bates & Company, in Philadelphia. Robert J. Schreiber, district manager of special switching systems in business services for American Telephone and Telegraph Company in Basking Ridge, N.J., recently celebrated 30 years of service with the Bell System.

'64

Air Force Lieutenant Colonel John D. Snyder was recently promoted to his present rank and is stationed at Offutt Air Force Base, Neb., with Headquarters Strategic Air Command.

'66

Benjamin J. Grycko has been appointed to the newly established position of product director, hemostasis, at Johnson & Johnson Patient Care Division, in New Brunswick, N.J. Richard Tucker, a former executive director of the Philadelphia Housing Authority, has been named director of the office of community investment of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in Washington.

'68

James E. McCloskey was a panel discussion member at the American Association of University Women's Philadelphia Branch Fall Conference, held in November.

'69

Michael Erfut has been named concept coordinator, financial department, at Gino's Inc., headquartered in King of Prussia, Pa. Martin E. Washofsky has been named controller of Allied Electric Supply, Inc., in Miami, Fla.

'70

Philip C. Claverelli has been promoted to assistant vice president at Fidelity Bank. Louis A. Nemeth, president of Capitol State Bank in Trenton, N.J., has been appointed to the board of directors of Mercer County, N.J. Community College Foundations, Inc. Thomas N. Pappas is president of William Bolton Associates, a Philadelphia-based executive search and recruiting firm.

'71



Jacob L. Katz

Jacob L. Katz recently received his MBA degree from LaSalle and has been named director of systems and programming at Certainteed Corporation, headquartered in Blue Bell, Pa. David T. Shannon has been promoted to associate administrator of North Penn Hospital in Lansdale, Pa. Robert Sorensen has been appointed treasurer and director of finance for Blue Cross of Pennsylvania.

'72

Norman M. Weiss is the owner and president of Swiftprint, Inc., in Fort Washington, Pa.

'73

Patrick J. Grugan has been named assistant controller for the Spectrum, Philadelphia's sports and entertainment facility. BIRTH: to William I. Weber and his wife, Elizabeth, a son, William Francis.

'74

MARRIAGE: John T. Hughes to Pam Scanlon.

'75

Karl Kreiser has been promoted to district sales representative for American Greeting Cards, Inc. Mary Masturzo has been promoted to the Philadelphia-Washington sales territory for Chesebrough-Pond's Inc. MARRIAGE: Karl Kreiser to Mary L. Masturzo.

'76

Julia G. Pollo has joined the audit staff of Arthur Young & Company, in the Philadelphia office.

'77

MARRIAGE: Joseph M. Montgomery to Patricia Glisson.

'79

Sharon M. Buckley has been promoted to marketing officer at Western Savings Bank, Philadelphia. Henry F. Janyszek, Jr., has been named assistant manager of the Phoenixville, Pa. branch office of the Germantown Savings Bank.

MARRIAGE: Francis M. Hegan to Mary Jo Conway.

BIRTH: to Donald Rongione and his wife, Maryellen T. Kueny, '79, a son, Christopher.

'80

Arthur W. Hicks, Jr., has joined the audit staff of the Philadelphia office of Arthur Young & Company. Joseph J. Sobotka has been named to the audit staff of Arthur Young and Company's Philadelphia office.

MOVING?

If your mailing address will change in the next 2-3 months or if this issue is addressed to your son or daughter who no longer maintain a permanent address at your home, please help us keep our mailing addresses up-to-date by

Name _____ Class Yr _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

1 PRINT your full name, class year and new address on the opposite form, and

2 Attach the label from the back cover of this issue and mail to the Alumni Office, La Salle College, Phila., Penna. 19141.

ATTACH LABEL HERE

Necrology

'36

Thomas B. Byrne

'53


Charles J. Navin, Sr.

'54

Ltc. George H. Roney, Jr.

'65

Edward H. Maenner





The Flight into Egypt

Georges de la Tour (French, 1616-1671)

La Salle Magazine
La Salle College
Philadelphia, Penna 19141

Second class postage paid at Philadelphia, Penna

